

b.) Remarks

Claim 1 is amended for better formatting and grammatical usage only. For the Examiner's convenience, the subject matter of the amendment may be found within original Figure 5. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

In the January 14, 2010 Advisory Action, the Examiner entered Applicant's January 7, 2010 Amendment after Final but stated such does not place the application in condition for allowance. Although that Amendment did overcome all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, the rejections for obviousness and obviousness-type double patenting remain. These are the only issues outstanding herein.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states

the present claims are drawn to a "display device." A display device as claimed does not require either of an auxiliary substrate or an installation substrate; however, in the interest of complete and compact prosecution the Examiner has rejected claim 1 as being obvious over Gehrmann et al. in view of Yamamoto et al. and Chirhart et al.

At the outset, then, Applicant wishes to gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's courtesy and helpfulness in expediting prosecution. For clarity, though, and so as to complete the record, as discussed in Applicant's prior Amendments and as recited in the claims, the present invention does explicitly recite an auxiliary substrate. That is to say, such was not recited in the claims as "being adapted for" or "intended to use with". Rather, to the contrary, the previous language was clearly "said display device being a number plate adhered to an auxiliary substrate".

Nevertheless, to reduce the issues, these features should now be even more clear in the pending claims as amended above.

In any event, according to the Examiner, Chirhart's retroreflective sheeting 12 reads on Applicant's display device, and Chirhart's plate blank 10 reads on Applicant's auxiliary substrate. However, even so, this does not provide *prima facie* obviousness as follows:

(i) the present invention is a "number plate" (claim 1, line 4) whereas Chirhart's retroreflective sheeting 12 in itself displays nothing, and even so,

(ii) Chirhart's plate blank 10 does not wrap-up anything, and certainly does not wrap-up retroreflective sheeting 12. In contrast, in the present invention, the auxiliary substrate wraps-up the substrate-adhesive layer. See Fig. 5. By these features, the invention of claim 1 make it vastly more difficult to remove the light-reflective resin sheet once installed in the auxiliary substrate.

Neither these features, nor the functionality provided by their claimed arrangement, are either taught or suggested by the prior art.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all of the Examiner's concerns are now overcome and the claims are now in allowable condition. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 remain presented for continued prosecution.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence S. Perry/
Lawrence S. Perry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,865

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LSP\ac